

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig(s). 1, 2, 3a, 3b and 3c. These sheets, which include Figures 1, 2, 3a, 3b, and 3c replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Remarks

Status of the Application

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 10-16 and 26-32 were pending. The Office Action mailed September 3, 2010 rejected claims 10-14, 16, and 26-30 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2002/0051119 to Sherman et al. ("Sherman"), in view of U.S. Patent 6,882,795 to McMurdie et al. ("McMurdie"), rejected claim 15 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman and McMurdie and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,272,613 to Sim et al. ("Sim"), and rejected claims 31 and 32 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman and McMurdie and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,523 to Detlef ("Detlef")

This paper amends claim 10. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, after entry of this paper, claims 10-16 and 26-32 will stand pending for examination. Claim 10 is an independent claim.

Claim Amendments

Claim 10 has been amended to correct several typographical errors, to recite "each particular content object" for purposes of clarity, and to recite, "each of the one or more content object entities being a separate device that is capable of displaying that particular content object." Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, including in particular at paragraphs 0030-31 of the written description.

Objections to the Claims

The Office Action objected to claim 10 for a number of formalities. Claim 10 has been amended to replace "entitles" with "entities" to remove the periods between "an Internet" and to refer to "each particular content object" and, subsequently, to "that particular content object." It is submitted that these amendments address all of the outstanding objections to claim 10, without changing the scope of that claim, and reconsideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings because the reference numerals and figure text are unclear. Four sheets of replacement drawings have been included herewith, and it is believed that these replacement drawings address the basis of the Office's objections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-14, 16, and 26-30

Claims 10-14, 16, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman in view of McMurdie. Claim 10 has been amended to more specifically indicate what is meant by the term "content object entity" (i.e., "a separate device that is capable of displaying that particular content object"). Thus, claim 10 recites a method that includes creating a guide indicating available content objects; this guide also lists, for each content object, one or more separate devices (e.g., televisions, etc.) that are capable of displaying this content object.

The Office Action correctly notes that Sherman teaches no such guide, but the Office Action contends that McMurdie provides the disclosure of such a guide. McMurdie is directed to "[m]ethods and apparatus for the recording of data to an optical media." McMurdie, abs. As such, McMurdie discloses a list of supported recording devices for a particular set of content that is to be written to optical media. While it is unclear how McMurdie's system could be combined with Sherman's video karaoke system with any reasonable expectation of success, neither of those references, nor their combination, teach or suggest the creation of a guide indicating, for each available content object, a list of one or more separate devices to which the content object can be directed, wherein each of the separate devices are capable of displaying the content object.

Accordingly, claim 10 is believed to be allowable over the combination of Sherman and McMurdie, and reconsideration of the rejection under § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 15

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman and McMurdie and further in view of Sim. The Office Action relies on Sim only for teaching the identification and removal of expired content objects, and Sim therefore does not supply the

disclosure missing from the Sherman/McMurdie combination, as described above. Accordingly, claim 10, at least as amended, is believed to be allowable over the combination of Sherman, McMurdie and Sim, and claim 15 is allowable over the same combination at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 10.

Claims 31 and 32

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman and McMurdie and further in view of Detlef. The Office Action relies on Detlaf only for teaching that content objects could be voicemail or email, and Detlaf therefore does not supply the disclosure missing from the Sherman/McMurdie combination, as described above. Accordingly, claim 10, at least as amended, is believed to be allowable over the combination of Sherman, McMurdie and Detlaf, and claims 31 and 32 are allowable over the same combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If it would be helpful to obtain favorable consideration of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call and discuss this case with the undersigned.

This paper constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and an authorization to charge all fees therefore to deposit account No. 19-5117, if not otherwise specifically requested. The undersigned hereby authorizes the charge of any fees created by the filing of this document or any deficiency of fees submitted herewith to be charged to deposit account No. 19-5117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2010-12-01

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King, #44,187
Swanson & Bratschun, L.L.C.
8210 Southpark Terrace
Littleton, CO 80120
Telephone: (303) 268-0066
Facsimile: (303) 268-0065